

**DRAFT**

**Economic Development Through Biomass  
Systems Integration in Central Florida**

**Final Report**

**May 5, 1995**

**Edited by**

**James A. Stricker**

**Dr. Wayne H. Smith, Project Director  
University of Florida  
Center for Biomass  
P.O. Box 110940  
Gainesville, FL 32611-0940**

**Prepared for**

**National Renewable Energy Laboratory  
1617 Cole Boulevard  
Golden Colorado 80401-3393**

**Letter Subcontract No. ZAU-4-13326-05**

**under**

**Prime Contract No. DE-AC02-83CH10093**

## Table of Contents

Summary .....	1
Objectives .....	3
Biomass Production System Components .....	4
1. Land Availability and Land Values (4); 2. Biomass Crops and Production Methods (9); 3. Estimated Establishment and Growing Costs (12); 4. Potential Harvest Methods (15); 5. Estimated Harvest Cost (20)	
Economic and Social Issues .....	24
6. Estimation of Production Costs and Establishment of the Regional Supply Curve (24); 7. Future Markets for Ethanol and Electrical Power From Biomass in Florida (39); 8. Socioeconomic Evaluation (42)	
Environmental Issues .....	44
9. Dedicated Feedstock Supply System (44); 10. Processing and Conversion of Biofuels (56)	
Biomass Seed Stock .....	61
11. Expanding Seed Stock Plantings (61)	
Materials Handling .....	63
12. Transportation Costs (63); 13. Sugarcane Pressing Strategies (66); 14. Storage Costs (70)	
Conversion Methods .....	72
15 Fermentation of Sugarcane Juice to Ethanol (72); 16 Conversion of Cellulosic Biomass to Ethanol (74); 17. Direct Combustion of Biomass Materials (84)	
Project Conclusions .....	87
18 Integrated Systems (87); 19 Optimum Systems (92); 20 Preliminary Business Plan (93)	
Further Development Work Leading to Commercial System .....	109
21 Land and Plant Requirements (109); 22. Additional Research Needed (110); 23. Pre-commercial pilot plant (112); 24. Conceptualized Commercial System (113)	

## List of Figures

Figure 1-1. Study area for land availability and land value for biomass crop production in central Florida . . . . .	5
Figure 6-1. Integrated biomass system in central Florida . . . . .	25
Figure 6-2. Crop activity timetable for sugarcane and herbaceous biomass crop . . . . .	31
Figure 6-3. Crop activity timetable for <i>Eucalyptus</i> species . . . . .	32
Figure 6-4. Crop activity timetable for chinese tallow and pine biomass crop . . . . .	33
Figure 6-5. Regional supply curve for biomass products in Central Florida . . . . .	37
Figure 6-6. Biomass Crop combination for production of one million dry tons a year. . . . .	37
Figure 16-1. Total compositions of whole leucaena determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	78
Figure 16-2. Total composition of sugarcane silage determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	79
Figure 16-3. Total composition of fresh sugarcane determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	79
Figure 16-4. Total composition of sugarcane presscake (3 press) silage determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	80
Figure 16-5. Total composition of sugarcane presscake (3-press). fresh determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	80
Figure 16-6. Total composition of fresh elephantgrass determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	81
Figure 16-7. Total compositions of air dried elephantgrass determined by total sugar analysis procedure (TSA). . . . .	81
Figure 16-8. Fermentation of hemicellulose hydrolysate from sugarcane bagasse using <i>E. coli</i> strain KO11. Corn steep liquor (CSL) and crude yeast autolysate (YA) were used as nutrients. . . . .	82

Figure 16-9. Inhibitor mitigation of sugarcane bagasse hydrolysate using hydrated lime. . . . .	83
Figure 18-1. Ethanol production systems from biomass in central Florida . . . . .	88
Figure 18-2. Electric power production from biomass in central Florida . . . . .	89
Figure 24-1. Two stage pressing of sugarcane with lignocellulose in presscake and other biomass materials converted to ethanol. . . . .	113
Figure 24-2. Two-stage pressing using two presses. . . . .	114

## List of Tables

Table 1-1. Land Available for Biomass Production in Central Florida . . . . .	6
Table 1-2. Land Values for Biomass Production . . . . .	7
Table 2-1. Suitability of Crops to Specific Soils . . . . .	9
Table 2-2. Yield Estimates and Expected Stand Life for Biomass Crops - Not Irrigated. . . . .	10
Table 3-1. Summary of Budgeted Costs for Establishing and Maintaining Biomass Crops on Three Soil Types in Central Florida . . . . .	13
Table 4-1. Plant Size and Row Spacing for Biomass Crops . . . . .	15
Table 4-2. Harvesting Machinery, Cane-Woody-Harvested in Billets . . . . .	16
Table 4-3. Harvesting Machinery, Cane-Grass-Woody-Chopper Harvesting . . . . .	17
Table 4-4. Harvesting Machinery, Grass-Cut-Dry-Bale System . . . . .	18
Table 5-1. Budgeted Costs for Harvesting Biomass Crops in Central Florida . . . . .	21
Table 6-1. Integrated Biomass Energy System Characteristics . . . . .	26
Table 6-2. Available Lands by Soil Types . . . . .	27
Table 6-3. Suitability of Crop/Soils . . . . .	28

Table 6-4. Biomass Crop Yields .....	29
Table 6-5a. Biomass Crop Production/Harvest Cost Estimates Using Levelized Cost Method, by Soil Types and Planting Methods, Farmgate Costs for <i>Eucalyptus</i> and Pine. ....	34
Table 6-5b. Biomass Crop Production Cost Estimates Using Levelized Cost Method, by Soil Types and Harvesting Methods, Farmgate Costs for Herbaceous and Sugarcane Crops. ....	34
Table 6-6. Mined Lands and Energy Facility Location - Polk, Hardee & Hillsborough Counties, Florida .....	35
Table 7-1. Energy Consumption Estimates by Sectors, 1983-1992 in Florida ...	41
Table 8-1. Biomass Crop Impact on Central Florida from Production of 500,000 Dry Tons .....	42
Table 10-1. Radium <sup>226</sup> Content of Soil and Biomass Materials .....	60
Table 12-1. Mined Lands and Energy Facility Location .....	63
Table 12-2. Distance from Biomass Production Sites to Plants (straight-line miles) .....	64
Table 12-3. Transportation Costs for Biomass Materials in Central Florida .....	65
Table 13-1. Results of Single Pressing of Chopped Sugarcane .....	66
Table 13-2. Results of Double Pressing of Chopped Sugarcane .....	67
Table 13-3. Results of Triple Pressing of Chopped Sugarcane .....	68
Table 13-4. Feed Analysis of Sugarcane, Sugarcane Presscake, and Presscake Silage - Northeast DHIA Testing Laboratory, Ithaca, NY .....	69
Table 14-1. Storage Costs for Biomass Materials .....	70
Table 13-1. Fermentation of Sugarcane Juice to Ethanol .....	72
Table 16-1. Ethanol Production from Hemicellulose Hydrolysate by E.Coli KO11 .....	77

Table 16-2. Sugar Composition of Hemicellulose Hydrolysate from Agricultural Products . . . . .	77
Table 16-3. Production of Ethanol from Agricultural Products Using KO11 . . . . .	78
Table 17-1. Moisture and BTU Values for Biomass Fuels for Direct Combustion .	84
Table 17-2. Ash, Chlorine, SO <sub>2</sub> , and Sulfur Values from Biomass Fuels for Direct Combustion . . . . .	85
Table 17-3. Ash Fusion Temperatures (Slagging Potential) of Selected Biomass Crops for Direct Combustion . . . . .	86
Table 20-1. Ethanol Pro Forma for Phase II Demonstration Plant Year 1 Based on A Combined Sugarcane, Elephantgrass, and Corn Ethanol Plant - Total Ethanol Produced: 5 Million Gallons Annually . . . . .	102
Table 20-2. Financial Summary From Pro Forma . . . . .	103
Table 20-3. Assumption Table for Pro Forma . . . . .	103
Table 24-1. Estimated Cost of Producing Ethanol from Sugarcane Grown on Phosphatic Clay Soil - Double Pressing . . . . .	115
Table 24-2. Estimated Cost of Producing Ethanol from Elephantgrass, <i>Eucalyptus</i> or <i>Leucaena</i> . . . . .	116

## Summary

Reclaimed phosphate mined land in central Florida has been identified as an area with potential for growing biomass crops. Approximately 73,000 acres of land could be available for biomass production should fuel from biomass systems prove profitable. Environmental impacts from large scale dedicated feedstock supply systems (DFSS) should be minimal provided best management practices are followed. A major environmental benefit for biomass/energy production is the reduction of buildup of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by recycling carbon dioxide. Utilization of waste streams from ethanol production may be further exploited for production of methane gas or for direct combustion. Another possibility is production of animal feed. Additional research is needed to fully define the possibilities.

A total of six crops have been identified as having the most potential for biomass production. They include the tall tropical grasses; sugarcane, energycane, and elephantgrass (also called napiergrass); leucaena (a woody tropical legume); Eucalyptus, and slash pine. Yields of the different crops vary according to the soil type and range from a high of 22 dry tons per acre, for sugarcane on phosphatic clay soil, to a low of 9 tons per acre for two varieties of Eucalyptus and slash pine. The crop with the lowest estimated production cost per dry ton was leucaena on phosphatic clay at \$3.45 per dry ton. The largest single cost component for biomass production was harvest costs. The most cost effective harvest method appeared to be a high capacity forage chopper.

A regional biomass supply curve was developed with annual production levels ranging from 100,000 to 1,000,000 dry tons. A mixture of 7 crops including 3 varieties of Eucalyptus was assumed. Crops were selected to give a year-round supply of feedstocks to minimize the need for long term storage. Production costs ranged from around \$25.00 per dry ton for 100,000 tons to about \$27.25 per ton for 1,000,000 tons. Production and conversion of 500,000 dry tons of biomass each year is expected to generate \$66,340,000 in total output of goods and services in the local economy plus 606 jobs.

Average transport distances for moving biomass materials from the field to the processing plants are projected to be relatively short. Average distances average about 10 miles. Projected travel time in relation to loading and unloading times was such that hourly rates rather than mileage rates were used to estimate transportation costs. Moisture content of biomass material was the most important factor in determining transportation costs. Field drying of some crops greatly reduced the transportation costs.

Sugarcane appears to be the most versatile biomass crop. Sugarcane may be harvested, pressed to remove approximately 85% of the sugars in the juice. The juice may be fermented into ethanol with conventional technology. The presscake can be hydrolyzed and the hemicellulose converted to ethanol. Cellulose might also be converted to ethanol or the cellulose and lignin might be used in an anaerobic process to make methane. The material might also be burned directly as boiler fuel. The moisture content of presscake, after pressing, is in the range of 60 to 70% which is too wet for efficient combustion. Wet presscake produced only about 2,500 BTU/lb when burned while dried presscake produced almost 6400 BTU/lb. Efficient methods are needed to dry the presscake or the remaining cellulose and/or lignin.

Potential ethanol yield per dry ton of sugarcane is 57 gal for juice, 30 gal from remaining sugars and hemicellulose and 32 gal from cellulose for a total of 119 gal. Presently cost for cellulose conversion is too high to be economically feasible. Research is expected to bring the cost down. With a sugarcane yield of 22 dry tons per acre each acre of sugarcane could produce a total of 2,618 gal of ethanol. The remaining lignin would still be available for direct combustion. With multiple uses of one feedstock the feedstock cost for additional processes is dramatically reduced.

In addition to their use as feedstocks for lignocellulose conversion to ethanol, sugarcane, presscake, elephantgrass, leucaena, and Eucalyptus may prove to be superior feedstocks for valuable products such as high purity cellulose and other chemicals. NREL's Clean fractionation process of separation of materials into constituents of cellulose, hemicellulose, and lignin shows great promise in offering an efficient and economical method opening the way of all three biomass fractions as sources of valuable chemicals and materials. This process could potentially offer glucose and xylose at lower cost for conversion to ethanol or for other marketable products, as well as making the lignin available for profitable uses. Patent applications for this process have been filed and further information is scheduled to be presented in the next few months. Biomass crops such as those grown on reclaimed phosphate are being considered as feedstocks for this process.

Based on project findings, a three phase scale up of a biomass to energy system is proposed. The first phase would be a cooperative effort with an existing conventional ethanol plant in the community. Enough sugarcane (about 250 acres) would be planted to supply the plant with feedstock for about 30 days. Equipment to hydrolyze the hemicellulose in the presscake would be added to the plant. The hemicellulose derived sugars would be fermented with genetically altered bacteria to produce ethanol. Data generated through this process would be used to develop a demonstration plant.

The second phase would include a demonstration plant with an ethanol capacity of 5,000,000 gal per year. It would be a hybrid plant combining conventional dry milling corn to ethanol with two biomass feedstocks; sugarcane and elephantgrass. The plant would operate with sugarcane, sugars and presscake, during the sugarcane harvest season (about 100 days). For the rest of the year (about 230 days) the plant would operate on elephantgrass and corn. The hydrolyzer would be sized to handle all of the presscake as it is being made; which would be about 177 dry tons of sugarcane per day. About 800 to 1,000 acres of sugarcane would be needed.

The elephantgrass would be processed at about 89 dry tons per day, a rate that is equivalent to the daily processing of presscake. About 1,000 to 1,200 acres of elephantgrass would be needed. Output from the plant would be 1.5 million gallons of ethanol per year from sugarcane, 750,000 gallons from elephantgrass, and 2.75 million gal from corn. The estimated net feedstock cost would be \$0.14 for sugarcane, \$0.40 for elephantgrass, and \$0.50 for corn. Total revenue for the plant is estimated to be \$8 million if CO<sup>2</sup> is sold for \$25 per ton, remaining cellulose/lignin for \$10 per dry ton, Distillers dried grains (DDGs) for \$125 per ton, and ethanol sells for \$1.25 per gal. Total revenue per gal of ethanol is estimated to be \$1.61 per gal and cost are estimated to be \$1.39 per gal.

The third phase would be a commercial plant with a total capacity in excess of 23,000,000 gal per year. The commercial plant would be built around a 5,000,000 gal per year conventional



ethanol plant, coupled with a lignocellulose conversion facility. Approximately 4,500 acres of sugarcane would supply the conventional facility with about 30% of the juice going directly to the plant during the harvest season and 70% concentrated to 70 degrees Brix and stored to operate the plant for the remaining part of the year.

The lignocellulose facility will be sized to convert all of the sugarcane presscake produced each day and be available to convert elephantgrass, leucaena, Eucalyptus or other biomass materials for the rest of the year. Presscake is expected to produce 6,200,000 gal of ethanol and other biomass, 12,400,000 gal. A mix of crops, to spread harvest over most of the year, will be used to better utilize equipment and reduce the need for long term storage of biomass materials. In addition to sugarcane about 10,000 acres of crop would need to be harvested each year to supply the plant, assuming a 68% conversion efficiency.

## **Objectives**

- \* Identify land for growing biomass crops and relate land location to location of present and potential conversion facilities.
- \* Identify potential biomass crops and estimate production and harvest costs for each crop and soil type.
- \* Evaluate environmental impact of large scale biomass production in central Florida and develop best management practices for biomass crops.
- \* Evaluate economic and social impact of biomass/energy systems in central Florida.
- \* Expand the supply of planting material for selected biomass crops.
- \* Evaluate biomass materials handling, storage and processing costs.
- \* Determine conversion rates for converting selected biomass materials to energy in various forms.
- \* Conceptually combine individual biomass/energy components into an economical, workable system.
- \* Identify land and conversion plant requirements for biomass to energy systems from a pilot scale to commercial production.
- \* Identify additional research needs for commercialization of biomass to energy systems.

## Biomass Production System Components

### 1. Land Availability and Land Values

W.V. McConnell<sup>1</sup>

#### *Land Availability*

Initially a large area of Polk and southeast Hillsborough Counties were considered as potential areas for growing biomass crops. Included was an area totalling 600,000 acres. Three categories of land were considered: cropland/improved pasture, unimproved pasture and mined phosphate land. The search soon focused on mined phosphate land in southwest Polk and southeast Hillsborough Counties (see appendix B).

Agriculture in the study area is based largely on range cattle production and citrus. A large part of the area, approximately 210,000 acres, is in unimproved pasture. Much of this land is rented on an annual basis at low rates. Only 1,100 acres is in row crop production, mainly watermelons and cantaloupes. The freeze of 1989 resulted in extensive losses of citrus especially in the northern part of the area. Much of the frozen citrus has been replanted either with citrus or pine trees.

The methodology used to determine land availability was to first send written inquiries to a number of different groups including: fourteen (14) phosphate mining organizations, thirteen (13) current applicants for reclamation funding, thirty nine (39) landowners holding 2,000 acres or more of land, plus, a 5% sample (57) of Polk County landowners with more than 40 acres of land and an ad valorem tax exemption for agriculture. Inquiries were also sent to trustees of the Florida Internal Improvement Fund, Southwest Florida Water Management Dist., Tampa Elect., Co., Florida Power Corp., City of Winter Haven Water and Sewer Dept., Lykes Corp., and Battle Ridge Corp. In addition, personal interviews were conducted with 17 individuals representing the phosphate industry, real estate, land owners, and government agencies.

Only five responses were received from the written enquiries. Due to present commitment to other uses and the lack of a demonstrated market for biomass crops, there was little expressed interest from owners of native land in production of biomass crops. The focus was turned to reclaimed phosphate land since that land is largely uncommitted to other uses and is available in large blocks.

Phosphate mining in Polk and Hillsborough Counties is phasing out. Of 20 mines operating in 1980 only seven will still be operating in 2000. By 2010 only 2 are projected to still be in operation. At the present time, 6 mines have closed since 1984. Much of the land in these 6 mines is still being reclaimed. After the land has been reclaimed and released by the Florida Dept. of Environmental Protection (DEP), Bureau of Mine Reclamation (BMR), the land will either be placed on the market and sold to private owners, leased to farmers, or farmed by the mining company. All three options may be observed in the area today. Presently a farming group has

---

W.V. McConnell, Land Management Planner/Forester, 1023 Luis Rd., Tallahassee, FL 32304